



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,300	02/17/2004	Edward K. O'Neil	ORACL-01448US1	9756
23910	7590	04/09/2009	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP			JACKSON, JAKIEDA R	
650 CALIFORNIA STREET				
14TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,300	O'NEIL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAKIEDA R. JACKSON	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 and 30-44 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-28 and 30-44 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the Office Action mailed September 15, 2008, applicant submitted an amendment filed January 15, 2009, in which the applicant amended and requested reconsideration.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant argues that the prior art cited does not specifically teach the claims as amended. In particular, Applicant's argue that the prior art cited does not teach the combination of presenting a user interface to a user wherein the user interface is operable to present information stored in a business object to the user, collect user information from the user, and store the user information in the business object; defining a data binding tag wherein the data binding tag includes a plurality of attributes; specifying a first action by the data binding tag; specifying, using a scripting language, at least one attribute on the data binding tag to reference the first data source associated a first action, wherein the first data source is in the business object; rendering each item in the first data source in the user interface output with a markup language based at least partially on the first action; and wherein the first action can set or get the first data source. Applicant's arguments are persuasive, but are moot in view of new grounds of rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1, 4, 6-15, 18, 20-28, 30, 33 and 35-44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hawley (WO 01/77822 A2), hereinafter referenced as Hawley.

Regarding **claims 1 and 44**, Hawley discloses a method and system for dynamically binding a user interface to information (data binding; table 1, page 59 with page 14, lines 21-32), hereinafter referenced as a method, comprising:

presenting a user interface to a user wherein the user interface is operable to present information stored in a business object to the user (business object), collect user information from the user (customer, contact, etc.), and store the user information in the business object (page 23, lines 1-21 with page 47, lines 1-35);

defining a data binding tag wherein the data binding tag includes a plurality of attributes (attribute; table 1, page 59 with page 33, lines 3-6);

specifying a first action by the data binding tag (binding data; page 14, lines 21-32 with page 40, lines 6-9);

specifying, using a scripting language, at least one attribute on the data binding tag to reference the first data source associated a first action, wherein the first data source is in the business object (business object; page 23, lines 1-21);

rendering each item (rendering objects; page 45, lines 1-5) in the first data source in the user interface output with a markup language (markup) based at least partially on the first action (page 31, lines 9-14); and

wherein the first action can set (set) or get the first data source (page 54, lines 15-20).

Regarding **claims 4, 18 and 33** Hawley discloses a method wherein: the first data source identifies one of: 1) an object field; 2) an object property; and 3) an Extensible Markup Language document element (XML; page 31, lines 8-14).

Regarding **claims 6, 20 and 35**, Hawley discloses a method wherein: the first data source is one of: 1) an array; 2) a list (list; page 35, lines 17-20); 3) a map.

Regarding **claims 7, 21 and 36**, Hawley discloses a method wherein: the markup language can include at least one of: Hypertext Markup Language (HTML), Dynamic HTML, Extensible HTML (XHTML), and Extensible Markup Language (XML; page 20, lines 2-5 with page 31, lines 8-14).

Regarding **claims 8, 22 and 37**, Hawley discloses a method wherein: the first action can be a child of another action (tree-viewer/hierarchy; page 32, lines 33-35 and page 13, lines 8-14).

Regarding **claims 9, 23 and 38**, Hawley discloses a method wherein:

the first action can have at least one child action (tree-viewer/hierarchy; page 32, lines 33-35 and page 13, lines 8-14 with page 40, lines 6-9).

Regarding **claims 10, 24 and 39**, Hawley discloses a method wherein:

the at least one child action can have at least one other child action (tree-viewer/hierarchy; page 32, lines 33-35 and page 13, lines 8-14 with page 40, lines 6-9).

Regarding **claims 11, 25 and 40**, Hawley discloses a method wherein:

the at least one child action can selectively process the first data source (tree-viewer/hierarchy; page 32, lines 33-35 and page 13, lines 8-14 with page 40, lines 6-9).

Regarding **claims 12, 26 and 41**, Hawley discloses a method wherein:

the at least one child action can refer to the first data source with a context defined by the first action (tree-viewer/hierarchy; page 32, lines 33-35 and page 13, lines 8-14 with page 40, lines 6-9).

Regarding **claims 13, 27 and 42**, Hawley discloses a method wherein:

the at least one child action can perform at least one of the following actions on the first data source: 1) set (set; page 54, lines 15-20); 2) get (get; paragraph 0194); 3) sort; and 4) filter.

Regarding **claims 14, 28 and 43**, Hawley discloses a method comprising:

rendering a list (list) or a table based on the first data source (page 35, lines 17-20).

Regarding **claim 15**, it is interpreted and rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim. In addition, Hawley discloses a machine readable medium (computer readable

medium) having instructions stored thereon that when executed by a processor (having a computer readable program; page 18, lines 1-12).

Regarding **claim 30**, it is interpreted and rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 1. In addition, Hawley discloses a software framework (software system; page 21, lines 53-35) for rendering at least one object on a user interface (page 39, lines 20-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 2-3, 5, 16-17, 19, 31-32 and 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawley in view of Secor et al. (PGPUB 2005/0027845), hereinafter referenced as Secor.

Regarding **claims 2, 16 and 31**, Hawley discloses a method for dynamically binding a user interface to information, but does not specifically teach that the data binding tag allows for the specification of JavaServer Page action elements.

Secor discloses a method wherein:

the data binding tag allows for the specification of JavaServer Page action elements (javaserver; paragraphs 0082, 0094), to insert cast amounts of data into the system quickly.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hawley's method as described above to allow network administrators to quickly and correctly determine what users and business processes are impacted by incoming faults so as to minimize the impact to critical business processes (paragraph 0012), as taught by Secor.

Regarding **claims 3, 17, 32**, Hawley discloses a method for dynamically binding a user interface to information, but does not specifically teach that the scripting language is based on the Javascript language.

Secor discloses a method wherein:

the scripting language is based on the Javascript language (scripting language; paragraph 0057), to insert cast amounts of data into the system quickly.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hawley's method as described above to allow network administrators to quickly and correctly determine what users and business processes are impacted by incoming faults so as to minimize the impact to critical business processes (paragraph 0012), as taught by Secor.

Regarding **claims 5, 19 and 34**, Hawley discloses a method for dynamically binding a user interface to information, but does not specifically teach that an object is a JavaBean.

Secor discloses a method wherein:

an object is a JavaBean (javabeans; paragraph 0194), to insert cast amounts of data into the system quickly.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hawley's method as described above to allow network administrators to quickly and correctly determine what users and business processes are impacted by incoming faults so as to minimize the impact to critical business processes (paragraph 0012), as taught by Secor.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAKIEDA R. JACKSON whose telephone number is (571)272-7619. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jakieda R Jackson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626
March 31, 2009

/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626